

# **Cognitive Systems Engineering in Military Aviation Environments:**

---

**Avoiding Cogminutia Fragmentosa!**



# **Cognitive Systems Engineering in Military Aviation Environments:**

---

## **Avoiding Cogminutia Fragmentosa!**

**EDITORS:  
MICHAEL D. MCNEESE  
MICHAEL A. VIDULICH**

Human Systems Information Analysis Center  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2002

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 074-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE April 2002		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED State-of-the-Art Report
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Cognitive Systems Engineering in Military Aviation Environments: Avoiding Cogminutia Fragmentosa			5. FUNDING NUMBERS SPO700-98-D-4001	
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael D. McNeese & Michael A. Vidulich (Editors)				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) HSIAC Program Office AFRL/HEC/HSIAC Bldg 196 2261 Monahan Way Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433-7022			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER HSIAC SOAR 02-01	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Defense Technical Information Center ATTN: DOD IAC Program Office (DTIC-AI) 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 0944 Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. Available solely through HSIAC for \$45.00 (US).				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A
13. ABSTRACT ( <i>Maximum 200 Words</i> ) <p>Complex environments place workers in an information-rich world with little time to make sense out of events surrounding them, assess their plans, make appropriate decisions, or perform multiple activities. This lack of “cognitive engineering” may produce <i>cogminutia fragmentosa</i>, where one’s cognitive world breaks down into small, isolated strands of thought as unanticipated events transpire. When this persists, there is no longer an <i>interface</i> between the worker’s cognitive world and the work for which he is responsible. <i>Cognitive Systems Engineering</i> (CSE) has been a response to work environments that produce cogminutia fragmentosa. As cognitive systems are proposed for complex environments, such as in military aviation domains, CSE is frequently utilized to understand and analyze various components of operator expertise and the interaction of expertise with specifications of the work domain.</p> <p>This report on CSE resulted from an international symposium, Cognitive Systems Engineering in Military Aviation, co-sponsored and organized under the auspices of The Technical Cooperation Program (TTCP). The symposium was held in conjunction with the 9th meeting of TTCP Group HUM (Human Resources and Performance), Technical Panel 7 (TP7) Human Factors in Aircraft Environments, hosted by the U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory (USAFRL) and held in Dayton, Ohio, 22-26 May 2000.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Cognitive Systems Engineering, Cognitive Task Analysis, Systems Design, Military Aviation, Human Factors, User-Centered Design, Systems Analysis, User Requirements, Decision Making				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 402
				16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	

# Contributors

**David Beevis**

140 Newton Drive  
Willowdale, Ontario M2M 2N3  
Canada

**Michael C. Bonner**

Land Operations Division  
Defence Science and Technology Organisation  
PO Box 1500  
Edinburgh, SA 5111  
Australia

**Klaus Christoffersen**

Institute for Ergonomics  
The Ohio State University  
290 Baker Systems  
1971 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210  
United States

**Blair Dickson, PhD**

Qinetiq, Centre for Human Sciences  
Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 0LX  
United Kingdom

**James R. Easter**

Aegis Research Corporation  
501 Grant Street; Suite 475  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
United States

**Jack L. Edwards**

AIM  
206 Keewatin Avenue  
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1Z8  
Canada

**Robert Eggleston, PhD**

U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory  
AFRL/HECA  
2255 H Street  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-7022  
United States

**William C. Elm**

Aegis Research Corporation  
501 Grant Street; Suite 475  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
United States

**James W. Gualtieri, PhD**

Aegis Research Corporation  
501 Grant Street; Suite 475  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
United States

**Keith C. Hendy**

Human Engineering Sector  
Defence and Civil Institute of Environmental Medicine  
PO Box 2000  
1133 Sheppard Avenue West  
Toronto, Ontario M3M 3B9  
Canada

**Howard Howells**

Qinetiq, Centre for Systems Simulation  
Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 0LX  
United Kingdom

**Eva Hudlicka, PhD**

Psychometrix Inc.  
1805 Azalea Drive  
Blacksburg, VA 24060  
United States

**Frederick Lichacz**

Defence and Civil Institute of Environmental Medicine  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada

**Gavan Lintern, PhD**

Aptima, Inc  
12 Gill St, Suite 1400  
Woburn, MA 01801  
United States

**Michael D. McNeese, PhD**

School of Information Sciences & Technology  
The Pennsylvania State University  
2M Thomas Building  
University Park, PA 16801  
United States

**Christopher A. Miller, PhD**

SIST  
1272 Raymond Ave.  
St. Paul, MN 55108  
United States

**Nicholas Milton, PhD**

Epistemics Ltd  
Strelley Hall  
Nottingham NG8 6PE  
United Kingdom

**Neelam Naikar, PhD**

Air Operations Division  
Aero & Maritime Research Laboratory  
PO Box 4331  
Melbourne, Victoria 3001  
Australia

**Kit Pleydell-Pearce, PhD**

University of Southampton  
Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ  
United Kingdom

**Scott S. Potter, PhD**

Aegis Research Corporation  
501 Grant Street; Suite 475  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
United States

**John Reising, PhD**

U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory  
AFRL/HEC  
2255 H Street  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-7022  
United States

**Emilie Roth, PhD**

Roth Cognitive Engineering  
89 Rawson Road  
Brookline, MA 02445-4509  
United States

**Penelope Sanderson, PhD**

University of Queensland  
ARC Key Centre for Human Factors and Applied Cognitive Psychology  
McElwain Building  
St. Lucia, Queensland QLD 4072  
Australia

**Nigel Shadbolt, PhD**

University of Southampton  
Electronics and Computer Science  
Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ  
United Kingdom

**Robert M. Taylor**

DSTL, Human Sciences  
Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 0LX  
United Kingdom

**Jeni Tennison, PhD**

Jeni Tennison Consulting Ltd.  
4 Dudley Court  
Beeston, Nottingham NG9 3HZ  
United Kingdom

**Michael A. Vidulich, PhD**

U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory  
AFRL/HECP  
2255 H Street  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433  
United States



**Sharon Whitecross, PhD**

University of Bristol  
Department of Experimental Psychology  
Social Sciences Complex  
8 Woodland Road  
Clifton, Bristol BS8 1TN  
United Kingdom

**David D. Woods, PhD**

Institute for Ergonomics  
The Ohio State University  
290 Baker Systems  
1971 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210  
United States

Several of the illustrations were provided by commercial publishers and those companies retain the right to the individual figures and associated material.

This material may be reproduced by or for the U.S. Government pursuant to the copyright license under the clause at 52.227-7013 (May 1987).

Additional copies of this state-of-the-art report (SOAR) are available for US \$45<sup>00</sup> (plus shipping and handling) from—

Human Systems IAC Program Office  
AFRL/HEC/HSIAC  
2261 Monahan Way, Building 196, Room 8  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-7022

Tel: (937) 255-4842  
Fax: (937) 255-4823  
E-mail: [sales@wpafb.af.mil](mailto:sales@wpafb.af.mil)  
URL: <http://iac.dtic.mil/hsiac>

# Preface

Cognitive Systems Engineering (CSE) is making an impact on a number of different domains in which people utilize their various abilities, skills, and knowledge to overcome and change challenging situations. Of contemporary importance is the domain of military aviation. As new challenges are created within this broad community, the need for CSE will become even greater to make a difference in how complex systems come to be used by individual users or crews. The new millennium already is offering a variety of advanced information technologies for military aviation. Coupled with decreasing resources and necessitated reductions in crew size, the role of CSE looms as an extremely relevant field of study—for both theoretical development as well as practical application.

With these ideas in mind, it is our privilege and pleasure to welcome you to an innovative new State-of-the-Art Report (SOAR) that introduces readers to cognitive systems engineering as it relates and applies to military aviation domains. It is our hope to present a broad—yet poignant—integration of perspectives, issues, methods, and applications that afford a first-look understanding of CSE for use within aviation fields of practice. The book will consist of nine distinct chapters that approach CSE in a special way. The chapters are taken from internationally respected authors and provide the reader with a thorough understanding of the foundation of CSE as well as how it relates to different facets of military aviation. As a reader, we believe you will discover an active and illustrative review of the state-of-the-art developments that scientists, engineers, managers, developers, and students must be aware of for furthering their knowledge and understanding. Having introduced our motivations for organizing the book, let's briefly survey the direction the book intends to take.

Complex environments of the 21<sup>st</sup> century place workers in an information-rich world with little time to make sense out of events surrounding them, assess their plans, make appropriate decisions, or perform multiple activities. In many cases, computational support and advanced interfaces for work activities have not been engineered with cognition or context in mind. Unfortunately, this lack of “cognitive engineering” may produce what we refer to as “cogminutia fragmentosa,” where the worker's cognitive world breaks down into small, isolated strands of thought as unanticipated events transpire (mental stovepipes). There can be a loss of meaning or control as the worker becomes separated from the demands of his or her work, and may remain lost in terms of comprehending the emerging elements of a situation. When cogminutia fragmentosa persists, there is no longer an interface between the worker's cognitive world and the work for which he or she is responsible. In other words, the worker cannot properly adapt to the situation encountered (i.e., a maladaptive state exists). If this state continues, errors, failure, and even catastrophic disasters are highly proba-

ble. This state may also contribute to affective and emotional responses (e.g., fear, anxiety, rage), which further complicate agent-environment transactions. However, all is not lost. We are now at a point in history where it is not uncommon to observe human factors practitioners referring to “cognitive systems engineering” as their method or tool of choice to respond to work environments that produce *cogminutia fragmentosa*. Indeed, as first-of-a-kind cognitive systems are proposed for complex environments, such as in military aviation domains, CSE is frequently utilized to understand and analyze various components of operator or team expertise (e.g., cognitive skills, engagement rules, specific knowledge); and the interaction of expertise with specifications of the work domain. As CSE is applied to real-world settings, agent-environment transactions can be quantitatively or qualitatively modeled (represented) and then used as a basis to predicate elements of a design (e.g., a human-computer interface, a decision support system). Typically, CSE practitioners engage workers through a variety of CSE methods that capture multiple facets of how work is transacted from agents to environment.

This book highlights the perspectives and foundations of an international community of practitioners who have both developed and applied CSE. One can see that the field emerges from several corridors that, in turn, produce alternative methodologies/approaches to address military aviation domains. Differing philosophies and techniques spawn incisive pathways of integration in the development of design artifacts. Because the aviation domain is fraught with multifarious levels of complexity and is demonstrative of *cogminutia fragmentosa*, we believe it supplies an excellent foundation for reviewing, assessing, communicating, and evaluating some of the principles (and nuances) inherent within various programs of CSE. The SOAR will emulate this objective by presenting the following sections for readers (along with their respective first authors):

- Foundations and Perspectives (Reising, Eggleston, McNeese, Woods)
- Methodological Pursuits (Potter, Neelam, Hendy)
- Innovations, Integration, and Application (Taylor, Hudlicka)

As editors of the book we challenge the reader to contrast/compare philosophies of use, theories of origin, goals, benefits, methods, tools, experiences, constraints and problems of applications, lessons learned, and examples as a means to generate new levels of understanding—as they relate to the specific constraints encountered in military aviation.

Michael D. McNeese  
*University Park, Pennsylvania*

Michael A. Vidulich  
*Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio*

January 2002

# About Human Systems IAC

The Human Systems Information Analysis Center (HSIAC) is the gateway to worldwide sources of up-to-date human-factors information and technologies for designers, engineers, researchers, and human-factors specialists. HSIAC provides a variety of products and services to government, industry, and academia promoting the use of ergonomics in the design of human-operated and manned systems.

HSIAC's primary objective is to acquire, analyze, and disseminate timely information about ergonomics. On a cost-recovery basis, HSIAC will perform the following functions—

- Distribute human-factors and ergonomics technologies and publications.
- Conduct customized bibliographic searches and reviews.
- Prepare state-of-the-art reports and critical reviews.
- Conduct specialized analysis evaluations.
- Organize and/or conduct workshops and conferences.

HSIAC is a Department of Defense Information Analysis Center sponsored by the Defense Technical Information Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. It is technically managed by the U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory Human Effectiveness Directorate, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, and operated by Booz Allen Hamilton, McLean, Virginia.





# Foreword

Cognitive Systems Engineering (CSE) theories, methods and their application have received increased attention by human factors and ergonomics professionals who design complex human systems. This is particularly true for the stressful, information-overloaded, time-constrained, lethal work environment within the military. Military aviation is only one of the important domains and is the primary focus of this report. The reasons for this increased emphasis are many and compelling. Most operator-interfaces with complex weapon systems are not designed with the cognitive work requirements of the operators as a formal consideration. Indeed, even the Command, Control, Communications, Computers, (C4), Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) [C4ISR] systems whose sole purpose is to support human situation awareness and decision making are rarely designed from a top-down, human-centered viewpoint. Improperly conceived and interfaced automation can lead to design-induced human error, particularly catastrophic in the aviation domain. This situation will only become exasperated as more uninhabited systems, such as unmanned combat air vehicles, are fielded. This comprehensive report examines in detail the various CSE foundations and theories, practical methods, and finally examples of applications to the design of complex systems. Chapters authored by leading experts in this increasingly important field provide a provocative analysis of progress, successes, and remaining challenges. Differences of opinion are intentionally presented to stimulate a thorough assessment of the state-of-the-art. More development is needed to formalize the methods that can be consistently applied in to bridge the remaining gap between CSE and complex system design. This single report informatively lays out these issues and serves as a guidepost for the way ahead. It is highly recommended reading for CSE researchers striving to mature theories and methods, and designers whose goal is to provide future warfighters with highly effective work-centered systems.

Maris Vikmanis  
Chief, Crew System Interface Division  
Human Effectiveness Directorate  
U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio





## Acknowledgments

The SOAR is predicated on and developed, in part, from an international symposium, Cognitive Systems Engineering in Military Aviation, cosponsored and organized under the auspices of the five-nation (United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand) forum for international research collaboration, namely The Technical Cooperation Program (TTCP). The symposium was held in conjunction with the 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of TTCP Group HUM (Human Resources and Performance), Technical Panel 7 (TP7) Human Factors in Aircraft Environments, hosted by the U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) and held in Dayton, Ohio, 22–26 May 2000. The purpose of TTCP HUM TP7 is to facilitate collaborative research and information exchange on human factors issues relevant to the extension of operational performance of advanced military aircraft. This symposium provided a timely opportunity to bring together key researchers and human factors specialists to discuss recent developments in cognitive systems engineering and to consider the implications for human factors issues in aircraft environments.

The holding of the International Symposium and the year 2000 meeting of the TP–7 Human Factors in Aircraft Systems panel were financially supported by the Crew System Interface Division of the U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL/HEC, Mr. Maris Vikmanis, Division Chief).

In addition to acknowledging the above support, the editors would like to thankfully give credit to an outstanding effort on behalf of Mr. Jeffrey A. Landis, Editor and Publications Manager, Ms. R. Anita Cochran, Associate Editor, Mrs. RoseAnn Venis, Associate Editor, and Ms. K. Ahnie Senft, Graphic Artist, all with the Human Systems Information Analysis Center, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Furthermore, we give special acknowledgements to our authors and their incisive efforts in writing these chapters. Without their contributions we could have not endeavored such an effort. Also, we would like to thank reviewers of the book, including Dr. Joe McDaniel, U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory, who serves as the U.S. Government Technical Manager for the Human Systems Information Analysis Center.

M. D. M.

M. A. V.



# Table of Contents

List of Figures	xxvii
-----------------	-------

List of Tables	xxxii
----------------	-------

## 1 Cognitive Engineering and Its Relationship to Future Aviation Systems 1

Abstract	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Problems with Current Systems	2
1.3 PHILOSOPHY OF AUTOMATION	3
1.3.1 Early Automation Philosophy	3
1.3.2 Today’s Automation Philosophy	4
1.3.3 Future Automation Philosophy	5
1.4 Operator and Electronic Associate Are A Team	5
1.4.1 Team Trust	6
1.5 Building the Electronic Associate	7
1.6 Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) and the Electronic Associate	8
1.6.1 Operator’s Station	9
References	11

## 2 Cognitive Systems Engineering at 20-Something: Where Do We Stand? 15

Abstract	15
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 Why Cognitive Systems Engineering?	18
2.3 Cognitive Systems Engineering Genotypes	20
2.3.1 CMU Genotype	21
2.3.2 OSU Genotype	26
2.3.3 RISO Genotype	31
2.3.4 UCSD Genotype	40
2.3.5 Conceptual Distinctions	43
2.4 CSE Engineering Practices	46
2.4.1 Analysis	46
2.4.2 Design	54

2.4.3	Evaluation	59
2.5	CSE Deployment	60
2.5.1	CTA and Other Approaches to Work Analysis	61
2.5.2	Judgment in CSE	65
2.6	Cognitive Systems Engineering: Where Do We Stand?	71
	References	72

### 3 Discovering How Cognitive Systems Should Be Engineered For Aviation Domains: A Developmental Look at Work, Research, and Practice

79

---

Abstract	79
3.1 Introduction	80
3.2 Query I: What Is It?	82
3.2.1 Orientation	82
3.2.2 General Definitions	83
3.2.3 What Does Cognitive Systems Engineering Consist Of?	84
3.2.4 Viewpoints and Converging Themes	84
3.3 Query II: What Are the Formative Conditions?	86
3.3.1 Human Factors Engineering	86
3.3.2 Knowledge Engineering	87
3.4 Query III: What Are the Objects of Interest of CSE?	88
3.4.1 Understanding Collaboration In Context	89
3.5 Query IV: What are Representative Approaches/ Premier Examples of CSE?	90
3.5.1 Theory-Driven Examples	92
3.5.2 Method-Driven Examples	96
3.6 Query V: What Has Transpired?	97
3.6.1 A General View	97
3.6.2 The Neonatal Stage	99
3.6.3 The Toddler Stage	100
3.6.4 The Formative Years	100
3.6.5 The Preteens	101
3.6.6 The Restless Teenager	103
3.7 Query VI: What Has Evolved/What Has Been Learned?	108
3.7.1 Summary	110
3.8 Query VII: Conclusions—What's Next?	111
3.8.1 The Challenges	112
References	113

**4 Balancing Practice-Centered Research and Design** **121**

---

Abstract .....121

4.1 Broken Pipes .....122

4.2 Complementarity as a Strategy to Balance  
Research and Design .....123

4.3 Moving Target .....127

4.4 Synchronizing Parallel, Interlocking Cycles .....128

4.5 Imbalance .....130

4.6 Points of Balance .....131

4.7 Different Roles for Human-Factors-Related Work .....132

4.8 Complementarity and Synchronization .....132

4.9 Acknowledgments and Recommended Reading .....133

References .....134

**5 Using Intermediate Design Artifacts to Bridge the Gap  
Between Cognitive Analysis and Cognitive Engineering** **137**

---

Abstract .....137

5.1 Introduction .....138

5.2 Developing a Design Thread From  
Cognitive Analysis to Decision Aiding .....140

5.2.1 Representing the Way the World Works—  
Building a Functional Abstraction Hierarchy ...141

5.2.2 Modeling Cognitive Demands—Deriving DRs ...144

5.2.3 Capturing the Means for Effective Decision-  
Making—Identifying Information Requirements ...146

5.2.4 Linking DRs to Aiding Concepts—Developing and  
Documenting a “Model of Support” .....148

5.2.5 Developing Prototypes That Instantiate the Aiding  
Concept .....149

5.3 An Illustrative Case: An Ecological Interface Supporting  
Command Decision Making .....150

5.3.1 Functional Abstraction Hierarchy (FAH) .....151

5.3.2 Decision Requirements .....154

5.3.3 Supporting Information Requirements .....154

5.3.4 Display Task Description .....155

5.3.5 Rapid Prototype of  
“Choose Combat Power” Display .....156

5.4 Discussion .....162

5.5 Acknowledgment .....164

References .....164

Abstract .....169

6.1 Background to CWA .....170

    6.1.1 Introduction .....170

    6.1.2 Work Domain Analysis .....171

    6.1.3 Control Task Analysis .....171

    6.1.4 Strategies Analysis .....173

    6.1.5 Socio-Organizational Analysis .....173

    6.1.6 Worker Competencies Analysis .....173

6.2 CWA and the System Life-Cycle .....174

    6.2.1 Requirements .....174

    6.2.2 Specification .....175

    6.2.3 Design .....175

    6.2.4 Simulation .....176

    6.2.5 Evaluation of Designs .....176

    6.2.6 Implementation .....176

    6.2.7 Test .....177

    6.2.8 Operator Selection .....177

    6.2.9 Operator Training .....177

    6.2.10 Routine, Nonroutine, and Maintenance Activity .....178

    6.2.11 Research (HF Studies) .....178

    6.2.12 Upgrades .....178

    6.2.13 System Retirement .....179

    6.2.14 Examples of CWA in Context .....179

6.3 Evaluation of Designs .....179

6.4 Analysis of Human-System Integration .....184

    6.4.1 AEW&C Activity Context .....184

    6.4.2 AEW&C Control Tasks .....185

    6.4.3 AEW&C Human-System Integration .....186

6.5 Training-System Design .....188

    6.5.1 Training Objectives and Design Objectives .....191

    6.5.2 Measures of Effectiveness and Data Collection .....191

    6.5.3 Basic Training Functions and Scenario Generation .....193

    6.5.4 Physical Functions .....193

    6.5.5 Physical Context and Physical Attributes .....194

6.6 Information Work Spaces .....195

6.7 Conclusions .....197

References .....198

## 7 Analyzing the Cognitive System From a Perceptual Control Theory Point Of View 201

---

Abstract	201
7.1 Introduction	202
7.2 Human Systems Analysis	204
7.2.1 Structured Analysis Techniques	205
7.2.2 Domains of Analysis	206
7.2.3 Reliability of Human Systems Analyses	208
7.3 Perceptual Control Theory	209
7.3.1 Information Processing Models and PCT	213
7.4 PCT Systems Analysis	216
7.4.1 Decomposing the Goal Structure	217
7.4.2 Analyzing the Cognitive and Perceptual Components	219
7.5 Analyses Emerging From the PCT Approach	223
7.5.1 Stability Analysis	224
7.5.2 Support to Higher-Level Goals	226
7.6 Application of PCT Systems Analysis	228
7.6.1 Land Forces Command System	228
7.6.2 Intelligent Adaptive Interfaces	230
7.6.3 Two Views	231
7.6.4 The Notion of Plans	232
7.6.5 The Nature of Hierarchies	233
7.6.6 Hierarchies and Plans	234
7.6.7 Hierarchies Revisited	236
7.6.8 Final Thoughts on Shared Concepts for Intelligent Adaptive Interfaces	237
7.7 Discussion	238
7.8 Summary	245
References	246

## 8 Cognitive Cockpit Engineering: Coupling Functional State Assessment, Task Knowledge Management, and Decision Support for Context-Sensitive Aiding 253

---

Abstract	254
8.1 Introduction	254
8.1.1 Cognitive Design Requirements	254
8.1.2 Background—The Development of Intelligent Pilot-Aiding Systems	257
8.1.3 Cognitive Systems Engineering Challenges— Supporting Adaptiveness	259

8.2	The Cognitive Cockpit .....	264
8.2.1	Assisting Cognitive Work .....	264
8.2.3	Functional Integration and Cognitive Control ..	267
8.2.4	Functional Architecture— Agents, Communication, and Tasks .....	273
8.3	Monitoring the Pilot—Cognition Monitor .....	275
8.3.1	COGMON Functions—Pilot State Assessment ..	275
8.3.2	COGMON Measures .....	276
8.3.3	COGMON Implementation .....	279
8.4	Monitoring the Environment— Situation Assessor Support System .....	280
8.4.1	The Development of Knowledge-Based Systems ..	281
8.4.2	SASS Functions—Situation Assessment and Tactical-Decision Making .....	282
8.4.3	SASS Methodology .....	283
8.4.4	SASS Implementation .....	286
8.5.	Monitoring the Mission Plan and Configuring the Cockpit—Tasking Interface Manager .....	287
8.5.1	TIM Functions—Task, Timeline, Interface, and Automation Management .....	287
8.5.2	TIM Implementation .....	290
8.6	Prototyping, Simulation, and Testing Intelligent Aiding ..	293
8.6.1	COGSIM Functions—Specification, Analysis, Development, and Test .....	294
8.6.2	COGSIM Methodology .....	295
8.6.3	COGSIM Implementation .....	296
8.6.4	COGSIM Demonstration and Test .....	300
8.7	Conclusions .....	304
	References .....	306

## 9 Beyond Cognitive Systems Engineering: Assessing User Affect and Belief States to Implement Adaptive Pilot-Vehicle Interaction 315

---

Abstract .....	315
9.1 Introduction .....	316
9.2 Affective and Belief States: Effects on Performance and Assessment .....	320
9.2.1 Effects of Affective States on Performance .....	320
9.2.2 Assessment of Affective States .....	321
9.2.3 Effect of Belief States on Performance .....	325
9.3 Related Work in Affect and Belief Assessment and Adaptation .....	327
9.4 ABAIS Adaptive Methodology and System Architecture ..	330



9.4.1	ABAIS Adaptive Methodology	330
9.4.2	ABAIS System Architecture	330
9.5	ABAIS Demonstration Task: Fighter Pilot “Sweep” Task	333
9.5.1	Task Context	333
9.5.2	Human Context	334
9.5.3	Summary of Demonstration Task Events	334
9.6	Cognitive, Affective, Personality Task Analysis (CAPTA)	334
9.6.1	Description of the CAPTA Process	335
9.6.2	Use of CAPTA to Support the ABAIS Architecture Development	337
9.7	User State Assessment and Behavior Prediction	342
9.7.1	User Affect and Belief State Assessment	342
9.7.2	Affect and Belief State Impact Prediction	348
9.8	Adaptation	349
9.8.1	Strategy Selection	349
9.8.2	GUI Adaptation	349
9.9	Demonstration of ABAIS System Performance	352
9.10	Summary, Conclusions, and Future Work	354
9.10.1	Summary	354
9.10.2	Conclusions	355
9.10.3	Future Work	356
9.11	Acknowledgements	359
	References	359

<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>367</b>
-----------------	------------

---

<b>Author Index</b>	<b>371</b>
---------------------	------------

---

<b>Subject Index</b>	<b>385</b>
----------------------	------------

---



List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Impact of automation on increasing mental distance between operator input and system output. . . . .3

Figure 1.2: Examples of rules to specify the relationship between the pilot and pilot’s associate (PA). . . . .7

Figure 1.3: Adaptive UCAV system diagram. . . . .10

Figure 2.1: Three aspects of the state of development of cognitive systems engineering. . . . .17

Figure 2.2: Naming convention to identify different strains or genotypes of cognitive systems engineering. . . . .21

Figure 2.3: The cognitive triad model of work-in-context. . . . .27

Figure 2.4: Multiple sources of cognitive demand. . . . .29

Figure 2.5: The abstraction hierarchy. . . . .33

Figure 2.6: A notional abstraction decomposition space for an enroute air traffic control work domain. . . . .34

Figure 2.7: The decision ladder modeling tool used to represent work activity in information processing terms. . . . .37

Figure 2.8: The seven-stage model of activity. . . . .41

Figure 2.9: Human work conceptualized from three different perspectives: An agent view, a task view, or a domain view. . . . .45

Figure 2.10: The CACSE conceptual representation of cognitive engineering as a human-centered development process that may be integrated with a software engineering development process. . . . .57

Figure 2.11: An example of a hierarchal task analysis representation for a volunteer scheduling system. . . . .62

Figure 2.12: A partial GOMS of the Atropos system using the GLEAN 3 GOMS formalism. . . . .63

Figure 2.13: An abstraction hierarchy model of the student volunteer scheduling work domain. . . . .65

Figure 2.14: A structural means-end relation embedded in an AH representation. . . . .68

Figure 3.1: Capturing cognitive systems engineering. . . . .86

Figure 3.2: A general framework of cognitive systems engineering. .98

Figure 4.1: A practice-centered approach to research. . . . .123

Figure 4.2: Discovering patterns in cognition at work. . . . .124

Figure 4.3: Leveraging research to generate useful design concepts. 125

Figure 4.4: The envisioned world problem:  
A moving target for design. . . . .127

Figure 4.5:	Mis-synchronized cycles. . . . .	129
Figure 4.6:	The engine of innovation: Balanced cycles. . . . .	130
Figure 4.7:	The engine of frustration: A recipe for design by trial and error. . . . .	131
Figure 5.1:	A sequence of analysis and design steps creates a continuous design thread that starts with a representation of domain concepts and relationships through development of decision support requirements to creation of visualization and aiding concepts and rapid prototypes with which to explore the design concepts. . . . .	141
Figure 5.2:	A sample goal-means decomposition from Woods and Hollnagel (1987) for one port (primary-system thermodynamics) of a nuclear power plant. . . . .	144
Figure 5.3:	Functional abstraction hierarchy of military command and control with the “Apply Military (Combat) Power” portion highlighted. . . . .	151
Figure 5.4:	Geographic map providing the scenario context for the “choose combat power” visualization. . . . .	157
Figure 5.5:	JOE visualization showing combat power of Red and Blue forces at the time that the 2nd and 4th Blue battalions and 5th Red battalion reach the “choke point” south of the Burke bridge. . . . .	158
Figure 5.6:	Updated JOE display reflecting the changes in relative combat power based on additional units selected. . . .	160
Figure 6.1:	Five general areas of constraints (boxes) work together to shape possible and effective action trajectories (arrows in center area). . . . .	171
Figure 6.2:	Five phases of CWA with iconic representations of their most familiar analytic products. . . . .	172
Figure 6.3:	Actual and potential uses of the five phases of CWA over the life-cycle of a complex sociotechnical system. . . . .	175
Figure 6.4:	(a) A global view of the AEW&C abstraction hierarchy. (b) A sample of functions from each layer of the AEW&C abstraction hierarchy. . . . .	181
Figure 6.5:	Structure of the group responsible for evaluating AEW&C designs. . . . .	182
Figure 6.6:	The activity context for AEW&C. . . . .	185
Figure 6.7:	Some of the control tasks for the surveillance activity of AEW&C with connections to aspects of the underlying work domain analysis. . . . .	186
Figure 6.8:	Decision ladders linked to show human-system integration. . . . .	187

Figure 6.9:	Connection between the functional structure of a work domain, training needs, and the functional requirements of training systems. ....	189
Figure 6.10:	The abstraction hierarchy offers a means for tracing the impact of various design decisions on training. ...	190
Figure 6.11:	(a) A global view of the F/A–18 abstraction hierarchy. (b) A sample of functions from each layer of the F/A–18 abstraction hierarchy. ....	192
Figure 6.12:	A set of tools used for knowledge acquisition and knowledge representation in each phase of a cognitive work analysis for identifying the design-relevant properties of an information-action workspace. ....	195
Figure 6.13:	A typology of display formats for different levels of abstraction. ....	196
Figure 7.1:	Relationship between the systems engineering (in dark gray) and human engineering processes (in light gray). ....	206
Figure 7.2:	The Perceptual Control Theory model. ....	210
Figure 7.3:	Multiple agents interacting through their influence on shared environmental variables. ....	212
Figure 7.4:	A framework for cognitive work analysis. ....	239
Figure 8.1:	Cognitive engineering methods. ....	256
Figure 8.2:	Relationship between system adaptiveness, human workload, and predictability. ....	262
Figure 8.3:	Initial conceptual prototype for the DERA cognitive cockpit. ....	265
Figure 8.4:	Offensive air functions. ....	267
Figure 8.5:	Task net of decision making. ....	269
Figure 8.6:	Strategy for aiding skill-, rule-, and knowledge-based behavior. ....	270
Figure 8.7:	Decision ladders for control task analysis. ....	271
Figure 8.8:	COGPIT agents architecture. ....	273
Figure 8.9:	COGPIT agents, processes, and tasks. ....	274
Figure 8.10:	COGMON structure. ....	276
Figure 8.11:	The CommonKADS models. ....	284
Figure 8.12:	SASS replanning task process. ....	286
Figure 8.13:	Flow of information across functions ....	289
Figure 8.14:	General architecture for tasking interfaces. ....	291
Figure 8.15:	Prototype tasking interface GUI. ....	293
Figure 8.16:	Structure of the COGPIT analytical and test work. ...	294
Figure 8.17:	Generic format of initial decision-aiding taxonomy. ...	296
Figure 9.1:	ABAIS system architecture. ....	319

Figure 9.2: High-level diagram of key demonstration task components. . . . .319

Figure 9.3: Summary of GUI/DSS adaptation strategies. . . . .333

Figure 9.4: Example of an affect state transition diagram resulting from cognitive-dynamic behavior analysis. . . .342

Figure 9.5: Sources of information for deriving pilot’s affective state. . . . .343

Figure 9.6: Frames 1 and 2 of the demonstration scenario: No adaptation occurs. . . . .353

Figure 9.7: Frame 5 of the demonstration scenario: Adaptation occurs to enhance visibility and status of ambiguous radar returns. . . . .354

Figure 9.8: Frame 9 of the demonstration scenario: Adaptation occurs to redirect attention and enhance visibility of incoming data to prevent fratricide. . . . .355

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Continuing Objectives .....82

Table 5.1: Template of Typed Decision Types and  
Associated Knowledge Acquisition Questions. ....146

Table 5.2: DRs Associated With the “Choose Combat Power”  
Visualization Concept .....154

Table 5.3: Supporting Information Requirements  
Associated With the “Choose Combat Power”  
Decision Requirement .....155

Table 5.4: Display Task Description for the  
“Choose Combat Power” Display .....156

Table 5.5: Mapping of Graphical Elements to DRs for the  
“Choose Combat Power” Display .....159

Table 7.1: Hierarchical Goal Analysis Four Levels Deep .....218

Table 7.2: A Template for Analyzing the Cognitive and  
Perceptual Aspects of a PCT Loop .....220

Table 7.3: Pick Lists for Cognitive/Perceptual Categories  
Describing Goal-Directed Human Activities .....222

Table 7.4: Template for Analyzing Non-Intelligent (Machine)  
System Components .....223

Table 7.5: Illustration of a Completed Template for an Activity  
Involving Both Internal and External Variables .....224

Table 7.6: Illustration of a Completed Template for an  
Activity Involving Internal Only .....225

Table 7.7: Stability Analysis .....226

Table 7.8: Analysis of the Upward Flow of Information in the  
System (Support to Higher-Level Goals) .....227

Table 7.9: Classification of Goal Relationships .....237

Table 7.10: Some Loose Equivalencies Between Procedures  
Used in MFTA, CWA, and PCT Systems Analysis ...242

Table 8.1: Prioritized Areas of SASS Support and Assessed  
Case of Supply .....285

Table 8.2: Summarized COGPIT Functional Decomposition ...298

Table 8.3: Baseline Cockpit Interface Technologies .....299

Table 8.4: PACT System for Pilot Authorization of  
Control of Tasks .....301

Table 8.5: Basic Experimental Test Design .....302

Table 8.6: Summary of COGPIT Engineering Methods,  
Tools, and Techniques .....305

Table 9.1:	Effect of Emotion and Personality Traits on Cognition: Examples of Empirical Findings . . . . .	321
Table 9.2:	Summary of Possible Affective and Belief State Influences on Pilot Behavior . . . . .	335
Table 9.3:	Relationship of CAPTA to ABAIS Architecture Components . . . . .	337
Table 9.4:	Examples of Pilot Cues, Situations, and Decisions . . .	339
Table 9.5:	Example Rules Predicting Impact of Anxiety on Performance . . . . .	339
Table 9.6:	Examples of Static Factors Used During User State Assessment . . . . .	345
Table 9.7:	Examples of Rules for Compensatory Strategies Selection . . . . .	350
Table 9.8:	Pilot Information Preference Profile: Categories of Information and Related GUI Modification Options . .	353





